

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-31 and 33-34 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 8, 20 and 27 being the independent claims. Claim 32 is sought to be cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. Claims 1 and 8 are amended. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action dated July 27, 2005, claims 27-31 are allowed. Claims 20 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Shaffer *et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,678,842 (hereinafter “Shaffer”), in view of Moon *et al.*, article from the 1999 Symposium on VLSI Circuits Digest of Technical Papers (hereinafter “Moon”). Claims 1 and 8 are objected to for minor informalities. Claims 1-19, 33 and 34 are indicated to be allowable if rewritten to overcome the aforementioned objections. Claims 21-25 are objected to as being based upon a rejected base claim.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Allowable Claims and Claim Objections

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating the allowability of claims 1-19, 33 and 34.

Claims 1 and 8 have been amended to correct minor informalities specified by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants request that the objections to claims 1 and 8 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 2-7 and 33 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 1. The objections to claims 2-7 and 33 are rendered moot by amended claim 1. Applicants therefore believe claims 2-7 and 33 are in condition for allowance.

Claims 9-19 and 34 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 8. The objections to claims 9-19 and 34 are rendered moot by amended claim 8. Applicants therefore believe claims 9-19 and 34 are in condition for allowance.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 20 and 26 based on Shaffer in view of Moon.

Regarding claim 20, the Examiner alleges that Shaffer teaches the generation of multiple time-staggered sampling signals (FIG. 1; reference elements 25-29) based on a master timing signal. Applicants disagree. Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, Shaffer, at column 5, lines 10-26, describes elements 25-29 as electrical conductors or wires providing parallel communication channels. More specifically, at column 3, lines 20-21, Shaffer teaches that the "four wires 25-28 are connected to carry information bits, while the fifth wire 29 carries a clock signal." These are not multiple time-staggered sampling signals as that term is used in claim 20, used in the specification, and understood in the art. Further, Moon does not cure the deficiency of Shaffer. Accordingly, claim 20 is allowable over Shaffer in combination with Moon.

Claims 21-26 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 20 and are allowable for at least the reasons applicable to claim 20, as well as due to the features recited therein. Applicants therefore requests that claims 20-26 be passed to allowance.

Second Supplemental IDS of February 28, 2005

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner acknowledge receipt and consideration of the IDS (Second Supplemental IDS) filed on February 28, 2005.

Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance

Applicants note the Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance presented on page 4 of the Notice of Allowance and directed to claims 27-31. Applicants reserve the right to demonstrate claims 27-31 are allowable over the art made of record for further reasons related to any of their recited features. Applicants further contend that reservation of this right does not give rise to any implication regarding whether the Applicants agree with or acquiesce in the reasoning provided by the Examiner.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Patrick E. Garrett
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 39,987

Date: 10/25/05

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600
448153_1.DOC